REMARKS

The Non-Final Office Action mailed November 22, 2010 and the references cited therein have been carefully considered. Claims 2-18 are currently pending. By the amendments herein, Applicant has separated the three alternative recitations from Claim 4 into three sets of claims, thus amending and adding new claims. Accordingly, option "a)" corresponds to independent Claim 4 with associated dependent claims 2, 7-18 and 29-31; option "b)" corresponds to independent Claim 32 with associated dependent claims 3, 5, 6, and 33-44, and option "c)" corresponds to independent Claim 45 with associated dependent claims 46-57. Additionally, new Claims 29-31, which are associated with option "a)" further define as aspect of Applicant's invention particular as described in the specification at page 12, lines 10-24 and/or illustrated in Fig. 6. Accordingly, no new matter has been introduced by the amendments presented herein. Applicant responds below to the issues raised in the subject Office Action.

Claim Rejections under 35 USC § 112

Claims 2-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Applicant has hereby separated the three options previously recited at Claim 4 into three sets of independent claims for consideration herein. Accordingly, it is believed that by the amendments herein, the rejection of Claims 2-18 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, has been rendered moot. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of this rejection.

Claim Rejections under 35 USC § 103

Claims 2-5, 12-15 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,491,324 to Schmitz et al. (**Schmitz**) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,820,971 to Kaule et al. (**Kaule**). Additionally, Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Schmitz in view of Kaule and further in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0190102 to Mullen et al. (**Mullen**). Also, Claims 7-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Schmitz in view of Kaule and further in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0256986 to Yadav (**Yadav**). Further, Claims 10 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Schmitz in view of Kaule and further in view of European Patent Application No. EP 0953937 to Power et al. (**Power**). Further still, Claims 16 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Schmitz in view of Kaule and further in view of WO 99/65699 TO Harris et al. (**Harris**). Applicant traverses these rejections as more particularly noted below.

As an initial matter, The above rejections have been rendered moot due to Applicants amendments presented herein, which are not intended to overcome the cited prior art, but to clarify which limitations of the claims correspond to which options (a, b or c) as originally intended by the Applicant. In particular, that the further limitations regarding the transfer film being applied to the adhesive layer, the carrier film being removed from the second film body, etc…as particularly defined in the last 6 lines of claim 4, relate to option a).

With respect to what was previously recited as "option a)", the claim 4 now defines that:

the carrier film is removed from the second film body including the first film body, the adhesive layer and the magnetic layer so that the magnetic layer remains on the first film body in the first region which is structured in pattern form and in which the adhesive layer is not hardened and is removed with the carrier film in the second region which is structured in pattern form and in which the adhesive layer is hardened.

The combination of **Schmitz** and **Kaule** fail to disclose this aspect of the disclosed technologies. Thus, Schmitz and Kaule fail to disclose or reasonably suggest all the elements of Applicant's claimed invention. Additionally, the further disclosures and teachings of **Mullen**, **Yadav**, **Power** or **Harris** also fail to disclose the above-noted aspects of Applicant's disclosed technologies. Thus, as it is clear that the above recitations were not interpreted to be included in option a) when making the above noted prior art rejections in the subject Office Action, it is apparent that Applicants amendments have thus rendered all these rejections moot, particular with regard to independent Claim 4 and dependent Claims 2, 7-18 and 29-31.

Further, in the previous Office Actions, it was indicated that the subject matter of options "b)" and "c" were allowable. Accordingly, as that subject matter is now defined in separate sets of claims, they are now in condition for allowance. Thus, independent Claim 32, corresponding to option "b)", with associated dependent claims 3, 5, 6, and 33-44 are all in condition for allowance. Also, independent Claim 45, corresponding to option "c)", with associated dependent claims 46-57 are also all in condition for allowance.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the various pending prior art rejections of Claims 2-18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as noted above.

Conclusion

Entry of the amendments herein and favorable consideration of Claims 2-18 and 29-57 is hereby solicited. In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, this application should now be in condition for allowance. A notice to this effect is respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions or suggestions to expedite allowance of this application, the Examiner is cordially invited to contact Applicant's attorney at the telephone number provided.

Respectfully submitted,

/tony a. gayoso/
Tony A. Gayoso
Registration No.: 37,331
Attorney for Applicant

HOFFMANN & BARON, LLP
6900 Jericho Turnpike
Syosset, New York 11791
(516) 822-3550
TAG:lg
350369_1.DOC